CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
COMMERCE AND ADMINISTRATION FACULTY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF MEETING
FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1983

In attendance: Dean Pierre Simon, Chairman

Professors: S. Alvi (Eco), S. Appelbaum (Mana), K. Argheyd (Mana), M. Armstrong (Eco), J.D. Blazouske (Acco), P. Brunet (Mana), T. Buckner (Arts & Sci), R. Curnew (Assoc. Dean), A. Crisalli (QM), J.S. Daniel (VRA), E. Douglas (Fin), J. Goodwin (Mana), T. Herbert (Mana), M. Laroche (Mktg), H. Mann (Acco), R. Oppenheimer (Mana), C. Patterson (Fin), P. Pitsiladis (MBA), K. Riener (Fin), H.B. Ripstein (Acco), C. Ross (Mktg), C.L. Sandblom (QM), R. Srinivasan (QM), D. West (QM), R. Wells (Assoc. Dean), B. Bereza (C.S.S.), W. Kovalchuk (C.S.S.), E. Luden (C.S.S.), R. Martin (Reg), R. Rohrlick (Libraries).

I Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 09:30 A.M.

II Closed Meeting - [redacted]

[redacted]

III Open Meeting

IV Approval of Agenda (CAFC-83-02A)

Professor Curnew moved that the Agenda be approved. Seconded by Professor Wills.

CARRIED

The Chairman recommended the Agenda be changed to put XI 1. Elections after Chairman's remarks.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

V Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (CAFC-83-01M)

Professor Brunet amended the Minutes to include the appointment of Dr. Steven Appelbaum as Dean of the Faculty under Section VI Chairman's remarks.

It was moved by Professor Blazouske and seconded by Mr. R. Martin that the Minutes be approved as amended.

CARRIED

VI Question Period

There were no questions

VII Elections

University Senate

Professors C. Patterson and H.B. Ripstein were nominated and elected to three year mandates on University Senate to commence June 1, 1983.

Senate Library Committee

Professor Suresh Goyal was nominated and elected as a member of the Senate Library Committee.

Computer Science Sub Committee

Professor Wade was nominated and elected as the Commerce and Administration representative on this Committee.

Arts and Science Faculty Council

Professor J.R. Goodwin was nominated and elected as the Commerce and Administration representative on this Committee.

Visiting Lectures Committee

Professor Sandblom was nominated and elected as the Commerce and Administration representative on this Committee.

VIII Business Arising from Previous Minutes

MISSION STUDY

It was moved by Professor Curnew, seconded by S. Appelbaum, that the Chair be turned over to Pierre Brunet for the discussion of the University Mission Study.

CARRIED

Professor Brunet advised members that the key elements and counter-points contained in Senate Document 83-1-D1- and CUSA and GSA response, Senate document 83-1-D2 were currently being discussed at Senate. He also assured the Council that the discussions so far had only reached Key Element #2 in 83-1-D1, that the discussions were preliminary, and no decisions had been taken as yet. He believed the discussions will continue through April and maybe longer. He strongly advised Commerce to make its position clear with regard to the "Key Elements" and asked for direction.

DISCUSSON ON KEY ELEMENT #1 AND COUNTERPOINT:

Key Element: "A commitment to education for the entire community."

". . . to create an appropriate environment that is linguistically and culturally receptive to all students who want to pursue their studies here, recognizing that the main language of instruction in this University will remain English."

Counterpoint: A commitment to education for Quebec's English-speaking community.

To provide an academic environment that supports and enhances the English-speaking social and economic communities within the Quebec milieu.

The main points raised by various faculty members were as follows:

1. A general feeling that the University has gone beyond serving only the English community as stated in the counterpoint.

2. The University is committed to the entire community and a recommendation to replace the word "Francophone" in Key Element 1 to "all".

3. We are speaking of the majority of the population and the word "all" muddies the issue. The Key Element is the Francophone community and how this University wants to relate to them in the future. Immigrants or foreign students are a completely separate issue.

4. Graduate student's concern that the Francophone reference is insulting and narrow.

5. The danger in being overly-explicit, and that active recruitment in the Francophone milieu could constitute a threat to their own recruiting efforts.

6. Responses to the conducted surveys, asking why Francophones came to Concordia were not unidimensional--answers are many and varied.

After much further discussion on how to officially express the Commerce point of view to higher university bodies, Dr. Daniel advised the assembly that they could move to support contents of the element "in principle".

It was moved by J. Daniel and seconded by H. Mann that Commerce and Administration supports in principle the contents of Key Element 1, "A commitment to education for the entire community."

CARRIED

1 OPPOSED
1 ABSTENTION

KEY ELEMENT #3 AND COUNTERPOINT:

Key Element: "Provision of a personal education in two distinctive settings."

"Because of the unique personalities of its two campuses, the University can provide its students with strikingly different educational environments, both of which are dedicated to the needs of individual students."

Counterpoint: Provision of a single basic educational setting, available equitably to all students.

In the interest of consistency and equity to both its students and the community, the University must provide a single, common denominator for all its educational endeavours.

The main points raised by members were as follows:

1. Commerce must take a unified stand on the proposal to have the entire Faculty housed on one campus.

2. The University has not capitalized on the distinctiveness of the two campuses.

3. The fear that Loyola campus will be underutilized with most capital campaign funds directed to the Sir George Campus.

4. This point goes beyond being a geographical question, to become more a question of philosophy, which is not clear in the Key Element statement. How will the two campuses be used.

5. The general feeling of members of the Faculty that Commerce is a faculty that belongs downtown with a full line of courses offered at Loyola. Market surveys show that two campuses are an asset attracting two different clienteles.

6. A concern that if the Business Administration program were housed at Loyola, it would be the ultimate demise of the program.

7. That the wording of the counterpoint contains fundamental contradictions.

It was moved by Professor Douglas, seconded by Professor Riener that Commerce and Administration supports in principle Key Element #3, "Provision of a personal education in two distinctive settings."

MOTION REJECTED UNANIMOUSLY

It was moved by Professor Oppenheimer and seconded by Professor Patterson that both campuses be maintained and that the Faculty of Commerce and Administration offer similar programs on both campuses.

CARRIED

1 ABSTENTION

KEY ELEMENT # 4 AND COUNTERPOINT

Key Element: "Support for lifelong education."

"The University remains committed to the integration of part-time and full-time studies and will continue to work imaginatively to develop varied professional, academic and popular credit programs that meet the specific community needs a student population with changing educational requirements and increasing average age."

Counterpoint: Support for pre-career education streams.

The University, to effectively serve and enhance the viability of its community, will concentrate its efforts on pre-career education, to maximize the length of its graduates' contributions to that community.

There was very little discussion on this key element. However, it was generally accepted that the Key Element also includes the counterpoint and that this University has been in the life-long education stream since its conception.

It was moved by Professor Douglas and seconded by Professor Goodwin that Commerce and Administration supports in principle Key Element IV, "Support for lifelong education."

CARRIED

1 ABSTENTION

DISCUSSION ON KEY ELEMENT #5 AND COUNTERPOINT:

Key Element: "Provision of quality research and service to the Quebec community."

". . . Concordia can enlarge its contribution to the community by developing programs designed to respond to the specific employment needs of the private, public and para-public sectors. At the same time the University will foster development of basic and applied research first and foremost in those units with an established reputation.

Counterpoint: Provision of quality research to the world academic community.

In its research efforts the University will stive to further the state of the art in its various disciplines, with a view to enhancing its reputation as a world class institution.

The main points raised by members were as follows:

1. Is Concordia interested in becoming world recognized?

2. The danger that "philosophical" statements when put into action can have a reverse effect. For example, if we adopt a "Quebec" only approach, funding for outside research may not be supported.

3. Key Element #5 can "ghettoize" this University.

4. The counterpoint statement should not include the word "academic".

5. Key Element #5 implies a restriction on academic freedom. The Key Element is a subset of the counterpoint.

6. The Key Element is restrictive and the wording of the counterpoint is vague.

There was no motion on Key Element #5, however the Dean requested that members adopt the following resolution which to date is not contained within the Mission Study.

> "Concordia University recognizes that it is part of a larger network of institutions of higher learning in Montreal, Quebec and Canada. Hence, this University is not able or always willing to fulfill all the higher educational needs of the national, or even provincial communities. But, we are willing to cooperate with others so that those needs and demands are adequately met. The reason for the Concordia Mission Study is to focus priorities on the areas where it feels it is best equipped to serve the needs of the Montreal, Quebec, and Canadian communities."

It was moved by Professor Curnew and seconded by Professor Blazouske that the above resolution be presented to the University Senate.

CARRIED

1 ABSTENTION

It was recommended that an open meeting of Faculty Council be held where further discussion and input can be received from all Faculty. The student position would also be discussed at that time.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 P.M.

IX Next Meeting

The Special Open Meeting of Council will be held on March 25th, 09:30 A.M. in GM-504.

The next regularly scheduled Meeting of Faculty Council will be held on Friday, April 8, 1983, Loyola Campus, AD-128 at 09:30 A.M.